# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/047,302 | 01/14/2002 | Ferhan Elvanoglu | 2890 | 5174 |

7590          04/11/2005

MICHALIK & WYLIE, PLLC
Suite 193
704 -228th Avenue NE
Sammamish, WA 98074

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| CERVETTI, DAVID GARCIA |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2136 | |

DATE MAILED: 04/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

| | | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Office Action Summary* | | 10/047,302 | ELVANOGLU ET AL. |
| | | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | | David G. Cervetti | 2136 | |

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>14 January 2002</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.     2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-63* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-63* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>14 January 2002</u> is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some *  c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/3/2002</u>.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____ .

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Drawings*

1.    The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: 20 (page 14, line 5, perhaps 110 was intended), 180 (page 18, line 16, perhaps $204_1$-$204_n$ was intended). Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### *Specification*

2.    The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: "RAM", "ROM", "EEPROM" (page 11, lines 14-15), "RF" (page 12, line 6), "XML", "XHTML" (page 17, line19). While well known in the art, these terms have not been defined.

3.    The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: "can accessed by the computer" (page 11, lines 19-20). Perhaps "can be accessed by the computer" was intended. Appropriate correction is required.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4.      The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5.      Claim 42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite

for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant

regards as the invention.

Claim 42 recites the limitation "wherein the negotiator" in line 1 of the claim.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6.      The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed
> publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

7.      Claims 1-2, 4-6, 9, 12, 17-19, 23-29, 32-33, 37-38, 47-48, 55-57, 62-63 are

rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Otake (Patent Abstract of

Japan, Publication Number: 2001-325249).

Regarding claim 1, Otake teaches in a computer system, a method comprising:

receiving a page comprising content including one or more elements; and controlling

page output and any actions corresponding to at least part of the content by: 1)

interpreting at least one part of the page based on a first set of security settings; and 2)

interpreting at least one other part of the page based on a second set of security

settings associated with an element of the page, the second set of security settings

being different from the first set (Abstract, security levels of the respective constituting

elements of the acquired document).

Regarding claim 2, Otake teaches wherein receiving the page includes accessing

data received from a remote source (Abstract, document server).

Regarding claim 4, Otake teaches wherein a first action is requested in the

content in the part of the page interpreted with the first set of security settings, wherein

a second action that is similar to the first action is requested in the content in the part of

the page interpreted with the second set of security settings, and wherein controlling

page output and any actions comprises, allowing the first action and disallowing the

second action (Abstract, judges whether the element can be presented to the user,

replacing the element judged to be impossible to present to user).

Regarding claim 5, Otake teaches wherein the first action corresponds to a

command to run a first set of script, and wherein the second action corresponds to a

command to run a second set of script (Abstract, security levels of the respective

constituting elements of the document from the server).

Regarding claim 6, Otake teaches wherein the first action corresponds to a

command to download a first set of data, and wherein the second action corresponds to

a command to download a second set of data (Abstract, security levels of the respective

constituting elements of the document from the server).

Regarding claim 9, Otake teaches wherein a first action is requested in the

content in the part of the page interpreted with the first set of security settings (Abstract,

security level for an element), wherein a second action that is similar to the first action is

requested in the content in the part of the page interpreted with the second set of

security settings (Abstract, security level for another element), and wherein controlling

page output and any actions comprises, disallowing the first action and allowing the

second action (Abstract, judges whether the element can be presented to the user,

replacing the element judged to be impossible to present to user).

Regarding claim 12, Otake teaches wherein the wherein interpreting at least one

other part of the page based on a second set of security settings comprises, recognizing

security data associated with the element, and associating the second set of settings

with the at least one other part of the page based on the security data (drawing 2,

paragraphs 22-29).

Regarding claim 17, Otake teaches wherein controlling page output and any

actions further comprises, accessing privacy settings (drawing 2, paragraphs 22-29).

Regarding claim 18, Otake teaches a computer-readable medium having

computer-executable-instructions for performing the method of claim 1 (Abstract).

Regarding claim 19, Otake teaches in a computer system, a method comprising:

authoring a page containing at least one element; and associating security data with an

element contained in the page (drawing 2, paragraphs 26).

Regarding claim 23, Otake teaches wherein associating security data with the

element comprises, providing a string of data corresponding to at least some of the

security settings (drawing 2, paragraphs 22-29).

Regarding claim 24, Otake teaches wherein associating security data with the element comprises, providing information indicating that the security settings should be determined relative to other security settings (drawing 2, paragraphs 22-29).

Regarding claim 25, Otake teaches computer-readable medium having computer-executable-instructions for performing the method of claim 19 (paragraphs 39-42).

Regarding claim 26, Otake teaches in a computer connected to a network, a system comprising: browser software that interprets content received from the network, and a security mechanism that associates a first set of security settings with a first part of the content, and associates a second set of security settings with a second part of the content, the second set of security settings different from the first (Abstract, security levels of the respective constituting elements of the acquired document).

Regarding claim 27, Otake teaches a negotiator that controls the second set of security settings (paragraphs 22-29).

Regarding claim 28, Otake teaches the system of claim 27 wherein the negotiator controls the second set of security settings relative to the first set of security settings (paragraphs 22-29, security level can be set up to the element level).

Regarding claim 29, Otake teaches the system of claim 28 wherein the negotiator controls the second set of security settings relative to the first set of security settings by having at least one setting in the second set be inherited from a corresponding setting in the first set (paragraphs 22-29, security level can be set up to the element level).

Regarding claim 32, Otake teaches the system of claim 26 wherein the second

part of the content corresponds to an element in the content (Abstract, security levels of

the respective constituting elements of the document from the server).

Regarding claim 33, Otake teaches the system of claim 32, further comprising a

component that detects security data associated with the element (Abstract, print

system compares security levels of the respective constituting elements of the

document from the server).

Regarding claim 37, Otake teaches wherein the security data associated with the

element comprises a string of data corresponding to at least some of the security

settings (drawing 2, paragraphs 22-29).

Regarding claim 38, Otake teaches wherein the security data associated with the

element comprises information indicating that the security settings should be

determined relative to other security settings (drawing 2, paragraphs 22-29).

Regarding claim 47, Otake teaches wherein the second part of the content

corresponds to a frame tag in the content (drawing 2, paragraphs 22-29).

Regarding claim 48, Otake teaches wherein the content comprises an HTML

page (Abstract, for an HTML document stored in a document server).

Regarding claim 55, Otake teaches a markup language document, comprising: a

first set of content associated with a first set of security settings; and a second set of

content associated with a second set of security settings, the second set of security

settings being different from the first set of security settings (Abstract, security levels of

the respective constituting elements of the acquired document).

Regarding claim 56, Otake teaches wherein the first set of content corresponds to a page (paragraph 24), the second set of content is included in the page (paragraph 25), and wherein the second set of security settings take precedence over the first set of security settings with respect to determining security for the second set of content (paragraph 26).

Regarding claim 57, Otake teaches wherein the first set of content corresponds to a page and the second set of content corresponds to a frame element included in the page (paragraphs 22-26).

Regarding claim 62, Otake teaches wherein the markup language document includes a string of data that corresponds to at least some of the second set of security settings (drawing 2, paragraphs 22-29).

Regarding claim 63, Otake teaches wherein the markup language document includes information indicating that at least some of the second set of security settings should be determined relative to other security settings (drawing 2, paragraphs 22-29).

8.      The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 49-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Anupam et al. (NPL document Secure Web Scripting).

Regarding claim 49, Anupam et al. teach a computer-implemented method, comprising: providing a page associated with a first security zone; and providing an element in the page, the element being associated with a second security zone that is different from the first security zone (pages 51-52).

Regarding claim 50, Anupam et al. teach wherein the element corresponds to a frame tag in the page (pages 47-48, Execution Environment, pages 51-52).

Regarding claim 51, Anupam et al. teach wherein the first security zone comprises an internet security zone (page 49, figure 2, Default Security Policy).

Regarding claim 52, Anupam et al. teach wherein the first security zone comprises an intranet security zone (page 49, figure 2, Moderate Security Policy).

Regarding claim 53, Anupam et al. teach wherein the second security zone comprises a restricted security zone (page 49, figure 2, Strict Security Policy).

Regarding claim 54, Anupam et al. teach a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the method of claim 49 (page 49).

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9.      The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

**10.      Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over**

**Otake.**

Regarding claim 3, Otake teaches the limitations as set forth under claim 1

above. Furthermore, Otake discloses accessing data from a server. Otake does not

expressly disclose wherein receiving the page includes accessing data received from a

cache. However, Examiner takes Official Notice that accessing data received from

cache is well known in the art. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was

made to one of ordinary skill in the art to access data received from a cache since

Examiner takes Official Notice that it is conventional and well known to access data

received from a cache.

**11.      Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over**

**Otake as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Malcolm (US Publication**

**Number: 2002/0087479).**

Regarding claim 7, Otake does not expressly disclose wherein allowing the first

action comprises, prompting a user for a decision and receiving a response indicating

that the action is allowed. However, Malcolm teaches wherein allowing the first action

comprises, prompting a user for a decision and receiving a response indicating that the

action is allowed (page 19, paragraphs 230-231). Therefore, it would have been obvious

to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to prompt the

user to make a decision based on security settings. One of ordinary skill in the art would

have been motivated to do so since it was well known in the art to prompt users for a

decision to confirm the action about to take place.

Regarding claim 8, Otake does not expressly disclose wherein disallowing the

second action comprises, prompting a user for a decision and receiving a response

indicating that the action is not allowed. However, Malcolm teaches wherein disallowing

the second action comprises, prompting a user for a decision and receiving a response

indicating that the action is not allowed (page 19, paragraphs 230-231). Therefore, it

would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to prompt the user to make a decision based on security settings. One of

ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so since it was well known in

the art to prompt users for a decision to confirm the action about to take place.

**12.    Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over**

**Otake as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Scanlan (US Patent**

**Number: 6,029,245).**

Regarding claim 10, Otake does not expressly disclose wherein the first set of

security settings are based on an identifier of the source of the page, and wherein

interpreting at least one part of the page based on a first set of security settings

comprises, retrieving the set of security settings based on the identifier, and associating

the settings with the at least one part of the page. Scanlan teaches wherein the first set

of security settings are based on an identifier of the source of the page, and wherein

interpreting at least one part of the page based on a first set of security settings

comprises, retrieving the set of security settings based on the identifier, and associating

the settings with the at least one part of the page (column 3, lines 30-60). Therefore, it

would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to have an identifier of the source of the page to determine the security

settings needed. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so to

dynamically assign security parameters to an HTML page (Scanlan, column 1, lines 45-

67, column 2, lines 1-5).

**13.    Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over**

**Otake and Scanlan as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Cohen (US**

**Patent Number: 6,516,308).**

Regarding claim 11, the combination of Otake and Scanlan does not expressly

disclose constructing a tree to represent the page, and wherein associating the settings

with the at least one part of the page includes storing data corresponding to the security

settings at a node in the tree. However, Cohen teaches constructing a tree to represent

the page (column 3, lines 55-67, column 4, lines 1-50), and wherein associating the

settings with the at least one part of the page includes storing data corresponding to the

security settings at a node in the tree (column 3, lines 55-67, column 4, lines 1-50).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to construct a tree to represent the page. One of ordinary skill

in the art would have been motivated to do so because it was well known in the art to process a document by building a parse tree (Cohen, column 3, lines 63-67).

**14.    Claims 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Otake as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of Cohen.**

Regarding claim 13, Otake does not expressly disclose constructing a tree to represent the page, and wherein associating the settings with the at least one other part of the page includes storing data corresponding to the second set of security settings at a node in the tree that corresponds to the element. However, Cohen teaches constructing a tree to represent the page (column 3, lines 55-67, column 4, lines 1-50), and wherein associating the settings with the at least one other part of the page includes storing data corresponding to the second set of security settings at a node in the tree that corresponds to the element (column 3, lines 55-67, column 4, lines 1-50). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to construct a tree to represent the page. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so because it was well known in the art to process a document by building a parse tree (Cohen, column 3, lines 63-67).

Regarding claim 14, the combination of Otake and Cohen teaches the limitations as set forth under claim 13 above. Furthermore, Otake teaches wherein storing data corresponding to the second set of security settings comprises negotiating the second set of settings (drawing 2, paragraphs 22-29).

Regarding claim 15, the combination of Otake and Cohen teaches the limitations as set forth under claim 13 above. Furthermore, Otake teaches wherein negotiating the

second set of settings comprises inheriting at least one setting in the second set based

on security information associated with a parent node in the tree (drawing 2, paragraphs

22-29).

Regarding claim 16, the combination of Otake and Cohen teaches the limitations

as set forth under claim 13 above. Furthermore, Otake teaches wherein negotiating the

second set of settings comprises receiving at least one setting in the second set based

on security information associated with a child node in the tree  (drawing 2, paragraphs

22-29).

**15.     Claims 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable**

**over Otake as applied to claim 19 above, and further in view of Anupam et al.**

Regarding claim 20, Otake does not expressly disclose wherein associating

security data with the element comprises, identifying a security zone. However, Anupam

et al. teach wherein associating security data with the element comprises, identifying a

security zone (pages 51-52). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use security settings

corresponding to a security zone. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been

motivated to do so because it allows the coordination of information when presented to

a user in multiple windows (Anupam et al., page 51, column 1).

Regarding claim 21, Otake does not expressly disclose wherein associating

security data with the element comprises, identifying a file. However, Anupam et al.

teach wherein associating security data with the element comprises, identifying a file

(pages 51-52). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the

art at the time the invention was made to use security settings corresponding to a

security zone. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so

because it allows the coordination of information when presented to a user in multiple

windows (Anupam et al., page 51, column 1).

Regarding claim 22, Otake does not expressly disclose wherein associating

security data with the element comprises, identifying a source of remote data. However,

Anupam et al. teach wherein associating security data with the element comprises,

identifying a source of remote data (pages 51-52). Therefore, it would have been

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use

security settings corresponding to a security zone. One of ordinary skill in the art would

have been motivated to do so because it allows the coordination of information when

presented to a user in multiple windows (Anupam et al., page 51, column 1).

**16.     Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over
Otake as applied to claim 26 above, and further in view of Scanlan.**

Regarding claim 30, Otake does not expressly disclose wherein the first set of

security settings is based on a network identifier of a source of the content. Scanlan

teaches wherein the first set of security settings is based on a network identifier of a

source of the content (column 3, lines 30-60). Therefore, it would have been obvious to

one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have an

identifier of the source of the page to determine the security settings needed. One of

ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so to dynamically assign

security parameters to an HTML page (Scanlan, column 1, lines 45-67, column 2, lines 1-5).

**17.     Claims 31, 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Otake as applied to claim 26 above, and further in view of Anupam et al.**

Regarding claim 31, Otake does not expressly disclose wherein the first set of security settings corresponds to a security zone. However, Anupam et al. teach wherein the first set of security settings corresponds to a security zone (pages 51-52). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use security settings corresponding to a security zone. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so because it allows the coordination of information when presented to a user in multiple windows (Anupam et al., page 51, column 1).

Regarding claim 34, Otake does not expressly disclose wherein the security data associated with the element comprises, a reference to a security zone. However, Anupam et al. teach wherein the security data associated with the element comprises, a reference to a security zone (pages 51-52). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use security settings corresponding to a security zone. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so because it allows the coordination of information when presented to a user in multiple windows (Anupam et al., page 51, column 1).

Regarding claim 35, Otake does not expressly disclose wherein the security data associated with the element comprises, a reference to a file. However, Anupam et al.

teach wherein the security data associated with the element comprises, a reference to a file (pages 51-52). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use security settings corresponding to a security zone. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so because it allows the coordination of information when presented to a user in multiple windows (Anupam et al., page 51, column 1).

Regarding claim 36, Otake does not expressly disclose wherein the security data associated with the element comprises, a reference to a source of remote data. However, Anupam et al. teach wherein the security data associated with the element comprises, a reference to a source of remote data (pages 51-52). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use security settings corresponding to a security zone. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so because it allows the coordination of information when presented to a user in multiple windows (Anupam et al., page 51, column 1).

18.     Claims 39-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Otake as applied to claim 26 above, and further in view of Cohen.

Regarding claim 39, Otake does not expressly disclose a tree of nodes constructed from the content, the tree including a first node corresponding to the first part and a second node corresponding to the second part. However, Cohen teaches a tree of nodes constructed from the content, the tree including a first node corresponding to the first part and a second node corresponding to the second part (column 3, lines

55-67, column 4, lines 1-50). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to construct a tree to represent the page. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so because it was well known in the art to process a document by building a parse tree (Cohen, column 3, lines 63-67).

Regarding claim 40, the combination of Otake and Cohen teaches the limitations as set forth under claim 39 above. Furthermore, Otake teaches a negotiator that controls the second set of security settings (drawing 2, paragraphs 22-29).

Regarding claim 41, the combination of Otake and Cohen teaches the limitations as set forth under claim 39 above. Furthermore, Otake teaches wherein the negotiator evaluates the second set of settings (Abstract, judges whether the element can be presented to the user, replacing the element judged to be impossible to present to user).

Regarding claim 42, the combination of Otake and Cohen teaches the limitations as set forth under claim 39 above. The combination of Otake and Cohen does not expressly disclose wherein the negotiator changes at least one setting in the second set of settings based on a rule. However, Examiner takes Official Notice that changing settings based on a rule is well known in the art. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to change settings based on a rule since Examiner takes Official Notice that it is conventional and well known to change settings based on a rule.

Regarding claim 43, the combination of Otake and Cohen teaches the limitations as set forth under claim 39 above. Furthermore, Otake teaches at least one other node in the tree that is associated with security settings based on inheriting information from a parent node (drawing 2, paragraphs 22-29).

Regarding claim 44, the combination of Otake and Cohen teaches the limitations as set forth under claim 43 above. Furthermore, Otake teaches the system of claim 43 wherein the parent node comprises the first node (drawing 2, paragraphs 22-29).

Regarding claim 45, the combination of Otake and Cohen teaches the limitations as set forth under claim 43 above. Furthermore, Otake teaches the system of claim 43 wherein the parent node comprises the second node (drawing 2, paragraphs 22-29).

Regarding claim 46, the combination of Otake and Cohen teaches the limitations as set forth under claim 39 above. Furthermore, Otake teaches the system of claim 39 further comprising, at least one other node in the tree that is associated with security settings based on security data of a child node (drawing 2, paragraphs 22-29).

**19.    Claims 58-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Otake as applied to claim 55 above, and further in view of Anupam et al.**

Regarding claim 58, Otake does not expressly disclose wherein the first set of security settings corresponds to a security zone. However, Anupam et al. teach wherein the first set of security settings corresponds to a security zone (pages 51-52).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use security settings corresponding to a security zone. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so because it allows the

coordination of information when presented to a user in multiple windows (Anupam et al., page 51, column 1).

Regarding claim 59, Otake does not expressly disclose wherein the second set of security settings corresponds to a security zone. However, Anupam et al. teach wherein the second set of security settings corresponds to a security zone (pages 51-52). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use security settings corresponding to a security zone. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so because it allows the coordination of information when presented to a user in multiple windows (Anupam et al., page 51, column 1).

Regarding claim 60, Otake does not expressly disclose wherein the markup language document includes a reference to a file that corresponds to at least some of the second set of security settings. However, Anupam et al. teach wherein the markup language document includes a reference to a file that corresponds to at least some of the second set of security settings (pages 51-52). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use security settings corresponding to a security zone. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so because it allows the coordination of information when presented to a user in multiple windows (Anupam et al., page 51, column 1).

Regarding claim 61, Otake does not expressly disclose wherein the markup language document includes a reference to a source of remote data that corresponds to at least some of the second set of security settings. However, Anupam et al. teach

wherein the markup language document includes a reference to a source of remote data that corresponds to at least some of the second set of security settings (pages 51-52). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use security settings corresponding to a security zone. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so because it allows the coordination of information when presented to a user in multiple windows (Anupam et al., page 51, column 1).

## *Conclusion*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to David G. Cervetti whose telephone number is (571) 272-

5861. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Ayaz R. Sheikh can be reached on (571)272-3795. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DGC

AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100